

Remarks

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13 and 15-22 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 13, 15, and 19 and cancelled claim 5 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 8, 13, 15-17, and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,006,171 to Vines et al. in view of U.S. patent 6,594,621 to Meeker. The Examiner rejected claims 4-7, 9-12, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vines et al. and Meeker and further in view of U.S. patent 7,120,830 to Tonack.

The combination of Vines et al. and Meeker does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 8, 13, 15-17, and 19-22 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest retrieving information associated with selected equipment, plant or process, presenting or displaying on a portable computing device at least information about a new event or an alarm for the selected device, utilizing by the maintenance user the information to address the new event or alarm, and establishing contact between at least one internal user or at least one external user about the selected equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the new event or alarm with the retrieved information, and providing of information to the maintenance user by the at least one internal user or at least one external user to address the new event or alarm. Vines et al. only suggests a system to manage maintenance orders. Meeker only suggests monitoring a plant. Neither Vines et al. nor Meeker suggests selecting a particular piece of

equipment by a user, obtaining information about that piece of equipment and addressing by the user an alarm or event related to the piece of equipment, and if necessary, contacting one or more other users, obtaining additional information from the one or more other users and the user using the additional information to address the alarm or event. Simply monitoring a plant and issuing a work order suggest first steps that might be included before carrying out the claimed invention. Also, the claimed invention does not even require issuance of a work order.

Additionally, Vines et al. does not suggest a portable computing device. Rather, Vines et al. only suggests, "selection of process control monitoring station, association of equipment tag names in the maintenance database with process control variables", which does not suggest selecting by a maintenance user using a hand-held or wearable portable computing device one of the equipment, plant or process.

Furthermore, Vines et al. also does not suggest configuring a software entity recorded on a computer readable medium with an identity of the selected equipment, plant or process, the software entity including links to information regarding all equipment, plant, process monitored and controlled by the control systems. Vines et al. only suggests a line between a process variable and a piece of equipment. Also, Vines et al. does not suggest links to information regarding all equipment, plant, process monitored and controlled by the control systems. Additionally, Vines et al. only suggests generating work orders, tracking work orders, and checking a status of work orders.

Vines et al. does not suggest retrieving contact information for internal users having

technical knowledge about a selected equipment, plant or process, and contacting the internal users about the selected equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the new event or alarm with the retrieved information. Vines et al. only suggests an operator who generates maintenance work orders, as described at col. 5, line 57, through col. 6, line 2. This operator does not appear to be a maintenance user who would employ information associated with the selected equipment, plant or process nor an internal user having technical knowledge about a selected equipment, plant or process. Also, the "crew assigned to do the work" is not an internal user having technical knowledge about a selected equipment, plant or process. At most the "crew" might include the claimed maintenance user. Vines et al. does not suggest retrieving information including maintenance information and technical information for use in addressing an event or alarm associated with selected equipment, plant or process. Simply displaying a maintenance issue and other maintenance issues does not suggest displaying information used to solve the maintenance issues.

Similarly, Meeker does not suggest displaying information about a selected piece of equipment. Rather, Meeker only suggests displaying a service or maintenance required at a location. Additionally, Meeker does not suggest contacting at least one internal or external user to obtain more information to address an event or alarm and using the information to address the event or alarm.

In view of the above, the combination of Vines et al. and Meeker does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 8, 13, 15-17, and 19-22.

The combination of Vines et al., Meeker and Tonack does not suggest the invention recited in claims 4-7, 9-12, and 18 since, among other things, Tonack does not overcome the above-discussed deficiencies of Vines et al. and Meeker. For example, Tonack does not suggest retrieving information associated with selected equipment, plant or process, presenting or displaying on a portable computing device at least information about a new event or an alarm for the selected device, utilizing by the maintenance user the information to address the new event or alarm, and establishing contact between at least one internal user or at least one external user about the selected equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the new event or alarm with the retrieved information, and providing of information to the maintenance user by the at least one internal user or at least one external user to address the new event or alarm. The Examiner asserts that col. 7, lines 4-26, suggests contacting an external user. However, this passage only suggests checking on service calls and sending service calls. Meeker does not suggest a maintenance user retrieving information for use in addressing an alarm or event and contacting an internal and/or an external user to obtain additional information to use in addressing an event or alarm. Tonack only suggests accessing information regarding whether a repair was carried out and when. No technical data is retrieved.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 22, 2010

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300